

“judaizers,” “converts,” and “adoptees,” along with their varying eschatological orientations. An extensive bibliography ends the volume.

The conference aimed to remedy long-term failures by scholars to process first-century Judaism accurately, sympathetically, and in its diversity, and to recognize knowledge of various “Judaisms” as key to tackling foundational issues in Pauline thought. Especially stressed are correlations between Qumranic themes and Pauline writings. This correspondence warrants further study to determine Paul’s possible indebtedness to a “prophetically inspired apocalyptic community similar to Qumran” (Donfried, p. 43). A second recurring emphasis is that Paul’s criticism of fellow Jews was typical of contemporaneous intra-family dissension.

Sorely absent is a Scripture index that would enable ready comparisons of how competing essayists interpret the same Pauline texts as well as how they cite Acts in defining Paul’s Jewish matrix. Missing, above all, is a sufficiently integrative discussion of several overarching methodological problems. First, no controls are anywhere specified on the propriety of citing Acts in defining Paul’s Jewish matrix (the matter surfaces on pp. 35-36, 66, 75, 81, 99, 101, 110, 112, and 255). Some scholars contend that Luke fictionally reframed Paul’s genuine profile in an *overly* “Jewish” way (cf. Acts 9:1-2; 13:9; 21:26, 40; 22:3-6; 24:12, 18; 25:8; 26:4-11, 19-23). Accordingly, recourse to Acts could be a contaminant in an effort to achieve a balanced definition of Paul’s Jewish matrix. Sanders alone (skeptical of Acts) raises the matter, but so gingerly as to skirt it. Second, the book is punctuated by brief disclaimers that Paul’s *Hellenistic* matrix should of course not be forgotten (e.g., Donfried, pp. 48-49; Sanders, pp. 51-52; cf. Ruzer, p. 78)—and apparently intended here is the influence of *pagan*, not only Jewish, Hellenism on Paul. These disclaimers seem to reflect hesitation by some writers lest their contribution unduly swing the pendulum too far from elements of Paul’s matrix that could be altogether Greek (even if already absorbed by Diaspora Judaism). Fredriksen and Destro and Pesce materially restore some balance, but the problem deserves an extended treatment. Another missing discussion concerns the propriety of trying to distill a consistent theological system from Paul’s Epistles, which most scholars admit essentially originated as “occasional” responses to disparate problems, drawing conclusions from Paul’s “theology ‘on the run’ and ‘in the making’” (Pollefeyt and Bolton, p. 239). We should forthrightly factor in that Paul’s writings were dictated, unrevised, and produced over more than a decade (impeding our grasp of development in his thinking). The addition of such integrative analyses would have sharpened this already rich and enriching volume on “the interplay of continuity and rupture between the apostle and the Judaism that formed him” (Casey and Taylor, p. 10).

Michael J. Cook, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, OH 45220

JOSÉ MIGUEL GARCÍA PÉREZ (ed.), *Rastreado los orígenes: Lengua y exégesis en el Nuevo Testamento. En memoria del profesor Mons. Mariano Herranz Marco* (Studia Semitica Novi Testamenti 17; Madrid: Encuentro, 2011). Paper n.p.

This eclectic collection attempts to shed light on various difficult NT texts by appealing to a hypothetical Semitic substratum and demonstrating that the Greek presents inac-

curate translations of original Aramaic or Hebrew texts. A related goal is to demonstrate the historical validity of these NT texts.

Following comments about the life and work of Mons. Mariano Herranz Marco by the editor, the cardinal archbishop of Madrid, a former student of Herranz Marco, and the president of the *Fraternidad de Comunione e Liberazione*, the volume is divided into three parts. Part I, addressing methodological criteria, presents "El valor del análisis sintáctico para discernir entre griego original y griego de traducción en la Biblia: *Status Quaestionis*" (Ignacio Carbajosa) and "La tradición evangélica y su original arameo" (José Miguel García Pérez).

Carbajosa clearly presents the issues involved and the assumptions operative throughout the volume. He is aware that most scholars believe the NT was written originally in Greek and that Semitisms can be attributed to Jewish authors whose original language was Aramaic. The question of a possible Aramaic or Hebrew original for some books (or parts of books) in the NT (especially the Gospels, the first half of Acts, and Revelation) rests on the hypothesis that the Semitisms result from an incorrect Greek translation. He claims, based on the work of Raymond A. Martin (*Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* [SBLSCS 3; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974]) and others (e.g., Elliott Maloney), that one can discern between translation Greek and literature originally written in Greek. Agreeing that the Greek of the Gospels shows Semitic influence, García argues that this is because a good portion of the Gospel narrative was originally written in Aramaic. Except for references to Matthew Black and Jean Carmignac, G.'s scholarly support comes primarily from works published between 1895 and 1952. He proposes as a test the translation of the LXX from Hebrew to Greek. He then cites similar examples (e.g., misreading of vowels, mistaken division of words) in which a reconstructed Aramaic original sheds light on a difficult Greek text (e.g., Mark 4:35; 11:13; 16:8; Matt 1:21; Luke 1:34). G. claims that scholarly resistance to this method is based in fear of change and that it is illogical for scholars to accept the reconstruction of some Jewish texts prior to the discovery of the Semitic originals but to refuse to apply the same method to NT texts. He also believes that scholars reject this approach because accepting it would mean their having to become experts in Hebrew and Aramaic. In addition, were these texts written in Aramaic they would probably have originated in Palestine at a date very near to the events themselves. This conclusion would revolutionize NT scholarship.

Part 2, on the Gospels, offers "Substrato arameo en Q" (Jacinto González Núñez); "Hebrew Sources of the Gospel of Mark" (Jean-Marie van Cangh); "La lingua di Gesù e la lingua del NT: Parole e frasi aramaiche nel NT greco" (Massimo Pazzini, O.F.M.); "La finalidad de las parábolas: (Mc 4,10-13 par.)" (Alfonso Lozano); "Exégèse judéo-chrétienne de Mt 27,51 et parallels" (Frederic Manns); "Luca ebreo? Piste attuali della ricerca" (Lesław Daniel Chrupcała); "El *Nunc Dimittis* (Lc 2,29-32) en arameo" (Jesús Luzarraga); "Jesús y Jacob: Los signos de Jacob en el Targum Neófiti a Gn 28,10 y la gloria de Jesús anunciada en el logion de cumplimiento mesiánico de Jn 1,51" (Domingo Muñoz León); "A Chapter of Johannine Theology: Revelation" (François Bovon).

González believes that the close relationship between Q or Matthew and Luke can be explained only by a written Greek text. It seems probable, however, that Matthew and Luke had different versions of Q's Greek material and that the Semitisms in Q are best explained by the influence of Hebrew-Aramaic material. Van Cangh considers Mark to represent

Peter's oral preaching in Hebrew or Aramaic. He believes that a Semitic reading of Mark's Greek sheds new light on certain texts (e.g., Mark 4:18-19; 9:18, 49; 13:28-29; 14:54), accentuating its Palestinian coloring (see his *L'Évangile de Marc: Un original hébreu?* [Langues et cultures anciennes 4; Brussels: Safran, 2005]). Luzarraga believes that there are vocabulary parallels between the *Nunc Dimittis* and the *Benedictus* and clear Semitisms favoring a Jewish-Christian composition. He concludes with a possible Aramaic translation of the *Nunc Dimittis*. Since Augustine, exegetes have seen a connection between John 1:51 and Gen 28:12. Muñoz León claims that *Targum Neofiti* helps in interpreting the relationship since it represents an Aramaic and Jewish tradition close to NT times. He seeks to demonstrate the Fourth Gospel's Palestinian Aramaic substratum.

Part 3 concerns other NT writings: "¿Comunidad de bienes en la iglesia naciente? (Hch 2,44s; 4,32)" (Mons. César Franco Martínez); "The Pastoral Epistles and Paul in Spain (2 Timothy 4:16-18)" (Rainer Riesner); "Muerto 'fuera de la puerta' (Heb 13,10-13): Teología de la cruz en la iglesia naciente" (Mons. Braulio Rodríguez Plaza). Mons. Francisco Javier Martínez Fernández offers an appendix, "Tres himnos de san Efrén de Nisibe en defensa del cuerpo y de la resurrección de la carne (Carmina Nisibena, XLIV-XLVI)."

Martínez addresses the claims that Luke is inconsistent in describing the community of goods (Acts 2; 4) and that these passages are idealistic, not realistic. He argues that the reconstructed Aramaic original of Acts 2 both erases any inconsistency and suggests a historical basis behind these texts. Examining the wording, style, and content of Luke and the Pastoral Epistles, Riesner concludes that Luke the physician and Paul's companion is the redactor of the Pastorals. He assumes that Luke wrote Acts around 64 and redacted 2 Timothy shortly after Paul's death.

In 2005, J. R. Davila published an article critical of Raymond Martin's method ("[How] Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?" *JSP* 15 [2005] 3-61). He notes that what seems to be translation Greek may be nothing more than a deliberate imitation of the LXX and that this Greek is possibly the redaction of an author whose maternal language is Hebrew or Aramaic. Carbajosa correctly observes that Davila's objections do not invalidate Martin's model, but they do remind us that the approach taken in this volume is hypothetical.

Dennis M. Sweetland, Saint Anselm College, Manchester, NH 03102

ANDREW B. MCGOWAN and KENT HAROLD RICHARDS (eds.), *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge* (SBLRBS 67; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011). Pp. xxii + 604. \$69.95.

This festschrift honors Harold W. Attridge, who stepped down as the Dean of Yale Divinity School in 2012 and was subsequently named to a Sterling Professorship, the highest honor for Yale faculty. Given his accomplishments at Yale and more broadly in the field of NT studies, a festschrift in his honor is not surprising. What is surprising and pleasing is that, whereas most festschriften are disparate collections without much regard for a narrative arc or unifying theme (apart from the honoree's research specialty), *Method and Meaning* is a remarkably well-structured and useful overview of various textual *corpora* and methodologies central to NT studies.